

Interview Summary

Application No.

09/725,728

Applicant(s)

ACKER ET AL.

Examiner

Jonathan S. Crepeau

Art Unit

1746

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Jonathan S. Crepeau.

(3) _____.

(2) Jay Yablon.

(4) _____.

Date of interview: 04 March 2003.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference

c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 20 and 40.

Identification of prior art discussed: _____.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Examiner indicated that amendment of 2/27/03 would not be entered since the claims would require further consideration over newly found prior art which had not yet been placed on the record. Attorney indicated that RCE would be filed to ensure consideration of the amendment.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant's representative proposed amendments to claims 20 and 40 reciting that the ordering step comprises "ordering from a remote supplier of source fuel replacements." Examiner indicated that this language complied with 35 USC 112, first paragraph and did not constitute new matter. However, Examiner indicated that the determinations of whether the amendments would be formally entered into file and the subsequent allowability of the claims would be made at a later time.